



## **Evaluation of University Professors' Performance in Light of Higher Education Quality Standards from the Perspective of El Oued University Students (In View of Some Demographic Variables: Gender, Level, and Field of Study)**

**Lacheheb ASMA**

University of El Oued, Algeria

Email: [lacheheb-asma@univ-eloued.dz](mailto:lacheheb-asma@univ-eloued.dz)

### **Abstract:**

*This study aimed to reveal university students' evaluations of their professors' performance in light of higher education quality standards. It was conducted through a field study on a sample of 200 male and female students (equally distributed between the Faculty of Technology / and the Faculty of Social and Human Sciences), who were randomly selected using a stratified sampling method from Martyr Hamma Lakhdar University of El Oued. The study followed the descriptive method and employed the faculty performance evaluation questionnaire adopted by Salman bin Abdulaziz University, which was adapted and standardized by Al-Jaradat (2015).*

*The results indicated that there were no statistically significant differences between the mean scores of students' evaluations of their professors' performance according to higher education quality standards attributable to the following demographic variables: gender, academic level (Bachelor/Master), and faculty (Technology/Social and Human Sciences).*

*Finally, after interpreting and discussing the findings in light of the psychological literature on the subject, the study concluded with a set of recommendations that may contribute to improving the performance of Algerian university professors in accordance with higher education quality standards, the most important of which are:*

- *The importance of establishing clear and publicly announced scientific standards through which the performance of university professors can be evaluated.*

- *The need to develop new and effective evaluation mechanisms, such as self-evaluation, student evaluation, and peer evaluation, given their significant impact on improving performance levels and their reflections on the quality of higher education.*
- *The necessity of adopting teaching performance quality standards as a key criterion in granting academic promotions, rather than relying solely on scientific research as the only basis.*

**Keywords:** *Evaluation, University Student, University Professor's Performance, Quality of Higher Education, Students' Perspective.*

## **Évaluation des performances des professeurs d'université au regard des normes de qualité de l'enseignement supérieur du point de vue des étudiants de l'Université El Oued (en fonction de certaines variables démographiques : sexe, niveau et domaine d'études)**

### **Résumé :**

*Cette étude visait à analyser l'évaluation par les étudiants de la performance de leurs professeurs au regard des normes de qualité de l'enseignement supérieur. Elle a été menée auprès d'un échantillon de 200 étudiants (hommes et femmes) de l'Université Martyr Hamma Lakhdar d'El Oued, sélectionnés aléatoirement par échantillonnage stratifié. L'étude, de type descriptif, a utilisé le questionnaire d'évaluation de la performance des professeurs adopté par l'Université Salman bin Abdulaziz et adapté par Al-Jaradat (2015).*

*Les résultats n'ont révélé aucune différence statistiquement significative entre les scores moyens d'évaluation de la performance des professeurs par les étudiants, selon les normes de qualité de l'enseignement supérieur, et les variables démographiques suivantes : sexe, niveau d'études (Licence/Master) et faculté (Technologie/Sciences sociales et humaines). Enfin, après avoir interprété et analysé les résultats à la lumière de la littérature psychologique sur le sujet, l'étude a formulé des recommandations susceptibles d'améliorer la performance des professeurs d'université algériens, conformément aux normes de qualité de l'enseignement supérieur. Les plus importantes sont les suivantes :*

- *L'importance d'établir des normes scientifiques claires et publiques permettant d'évaluer la performance des professeurs d'université.*



**Soumission : 13/04/2025    Acceptation : 09/06/2025    Publication : 25/08/2025**

- *La nécessité de développer des mécanismes d'évaluation nouveaux et efficaces, tels que l'auto-évaluation, l'évaluation par les étudiants et l'évaluation par les pairs, compte tenu de leur impact significatif sur l'amélioration des niveaux de performance et de leur influence sur la qualité de l'enseignement supérieur.*
- *La nécessité d'adopter des normes de qualité de l'enseignement comme critère essentiel pour l'octroi des promotions universitaires, plutôt que de se fonder uniquement sur la recherche scientifique.*

**Mots-clés :** *Évaluation, Étudiant universitaire, Performance des professeurs d'université, Qualité de l'enseignement supérieur, Point de vue des étudiants.*

## **Introduction:**

The issue of quality performance in higher education has become a major concern both in the Arab world and globally, as it revolves around understanding human behavior. The university's role is no longer limited to providing students with knowledge within classrooms but extends to advancing society and leading processes of change and development to achieve the goals of comprehensive development in all societies, regardless of their diversity and differences.

Therefore, raising the level of universities has become not only an official requirement but also a popular and societal demand, since universities bear significant responsibilities toward their communities. They are expected to exert the greatest influence on the environment in which they operate. As Sheldon (1923) pointed out, the responsibility of any organization is primarily a social responsibility, and its continuation depends on fulfilling its social requirements.

Many researchers in the field of higher education quality emphasize the crucial role played by faculty members, who bear the responsibility for achieving many of the standards related to education quality, as they represent the most important inputs by virtue of their roles. Others argue that the quality of faculty members is also linked to procedures related to their training, promotion, community service contributions, and the effectiveness of their participation in academic committees and scientific bodies.

## ***Research Problem:***

Higher education in the Arab world has witnessed an astonishing quantitative expansion over the past three



**Soumission : 13/04/2025    Acceptation : 09/06/2025    Publication : 25/08/2025**

decades. However, this quantitative growth has not been accompanied by an improvement in the quality and effectiveness of this education. Higher education institutions in the Arab world cannot isolate themselves from the global environment, which is characterized by a strong emphasis on ensuring and maintaining quality (Ababneh, 2015, p. 768). Therefore, in recent decades, Arab universities have increasingly focused on aligning with international quality standards.

Similarly, the higher education system in Algeria, like that of many other countries, is undergoing extensive reforms aimed at keeping pace with the global transformations that have affected higher education systems, particularly in countries north of the Mediterranean. This university reform involves integrating Algerian universities into what is known as the internationalization of higher education, which requires a set of procedures and adjustments designed to enhance their effectiveness and, consequently, improve the quality of their outputs (Saifour, 2013, p. 70).

This explains the growing attention given to academic performance evaluation in universities, especially with the adoption of accreditation and quality assurance systems in higher education. Waterbury (2008) referred to the first decade of the 21st century as the era of higher education accountability and evaluation. Evaluation encompasses all elements of the university system inputs, processes, and outputs while performance evaluation focuses on the university's core functions: teaching, scientific research, and community service. The Arab Forum for Human Resources Management detailed the main components of university performance evaluation, including faculty members,

academic programs, libraries, information centers and learning resources, financial aspects, buildings and facilities related to the educational process, student and staff services, and research activities (Ababneh, 2011, p. 4).

Accordingly, the university professor represents the most important component of the higher education system, as they bear the primary responsibility for carrying out its essential roles in teaching, research, and community service. The professor is considered the cornerstone of the educational process, which, at the same time, faces intellectual stagnation among a significant proportion of faculty members whose academic ambitions fall short of creativity and innovation in their performance. This lack of renewal constitutes one of the key challenges universities face in developing and modernizing their academic performance systems. Therefore, measuring the academic performance of faculty members has become essential for the success of the educational process (Ibrahim, 2012, p. 294).

Conversely, evaluating the quality of a faculty member's performance is one of the key indicators that helps them recognize their mistakes and weaknesses while reinforcing the strengths of their performance. This evaluation process involves collecting information about the various academic roles and functions carried out by the faculty member teaching, scientific research, and community service and assessing them according to specific standards in order to identify strengths and weaknesses, improve performance quality, and ensure the satisfaction of those benefiting from their services (Ragad, 2015, p. 141).

Since the student is the primary and direct beneficiary of the university professor's services, their evaluation of the extent of their benefit, and its comparison with international



standards of higher education quality, represents a valuable feedback mechanism that helps professors enhance their professional competence.

In light of these considerations, the study raises the following research questions:

- What are Algerian university students' evaluations of their professors' performance in light of higher education quality standards?
- Do Algerian university students differ in their evaluation of their professors' performance according to certain demographic variables (gender, academic level, and field of study)?

### ***Study Hypotheses:***

A hypothesis is considered a temporary solution that is verified through the steps of the scientific method. Accordingly, the hypotheses of this study were formulated as follows:

- 1) There are no statistically significant differences between students' evaluations of their professors' performance in light of higher education quality standards attributable to the faculty variable (Technology / Social and Human Sciences).
- 2) There are no statistically significant differences between students' evaluations of their professors' performance in light of higher education quality standards attributable to the gender variable (female / male).
- 3) There are no statistically significant differences between students' evaluations of their professors' performance in light of higher education quality

standards attributable to the academic level variable (Master / Bachelor).

### ***Study Objectives:***

This study aims to:

- Identify university students' evaluations of the university professor's performance in light of higher education quality standards.
- Examine the effect of certain demographic variables on students' evaluation of their professors' performance in light of higher education quality standards.

### ***Significance of the Study:***

The importance of this study stems from:

- The central role of the university professor in the educational and formative process, and the importance of evaluating their performance in fulfilling this role.
- The potential contribution of the study's results to improving certain aspects of higher education in Algeria.
- The importance and prominence of the concept of quality, particularly the quality of higher education, in the modern era.

## **1. Study Concepts:**

### **1.1. Quality of University Education:**

According to the UNESCO Conference (1998), quality in higher education is defined as "a multidimensional concept encompassing all functions and activities of education, such as curricula and educational programs, scientific research, students, buildings and facilities, university administration, and the academic environment" (Aissawi, 2024, p. 128).



**Soumission : 13/04/2025    Acceptation : 09/06/2025    Publication : 25/08/2025**

Accordingly, quality in higher education includes inputs represented by students, professors, and infrastructure, as well as processes that comprise teaching and learning activities, while graduates with high competence constitute the outputs. Therefore, the quality of higher education lies in the approach adopted by faculty members and administrators to ensure the proper training and development of students.

In the present study, it refers to a set of activities and processes that are expected to be implemented within the university environment to meet students' needs and societal expectations, with the aim of achieving the goals set by the university, which are themselves based on international standards of higher education quality.

## **1.2. Quality Standards:**

Quality standards are defined as “a set of criteria and characteristics that should be met by all components of the educational process whether related to inputs, processes, or outputs that fulfill the needs and requirements of society, as well as the desires and needs of learners. These standards are achieved through the effective use of all human and material resources” (Ben Oum El Saad, 2020, p. 34).

In other words, they represent a set of fundamental and effective determinants, or scientifically defined and objective benchmarks, used to assess the quality of higher education.

## **1.3. Standards to Be Followed in Evaluating the Quality of University Education:**

Performance evaluation, in general, refers to the process of obtaining specific facts and data that help analyze,

understand, and assess an employee’s performance at work (Al-Tamimi, 2020, p. 9).

Modern approaches to quality measurement and management emphasize a comprehensive perspective regarding the standards used to evaluate the quality of higher education. These standards are not limited to measuring the outputs of higher education represented by the attitudinal, cognitive, skill-based, and behavioral characteristics of graduates but also extend to assessing the quality of the educational service itself, including the quality of all components involved in providing education at the institutional level.

In 1992, the British Department for Education established a permanent committee to evaluate the quality of these components. The following table presents the standards to be followed in evaluating the quality of educational services and the aspects of quality they encompass (Aleimat, 2015, pp. 131-132):

**Table (01): Standards for Evaluating the Quality of Educational Service in Higher Education**

The element	Aspects of quality
1/ The scientific method	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The extent of coverage of the core topics.</li> <li>• Suitability to the student’s level of comprehension at this stage.</li> <li>• Relevance to practical reality.</li> <li>• Mastery of</li> </ul>



	<p>fundamental knowledge.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Preparing the student for globalization through learning a foreign language.</li></ul>
<b>2/Scientific reference</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The degree of scientific level and reliability.</li><li>• The format and presentation style of the scientific reference.</li><li>• The price of the scientific reference.</li><li>• The extent of benefit derived from the scientific reference.</li><li>• The originality of the scientific material.</li><li>• The types of attitudes fostered by the scientific reference.</li></ul>
<b>3/Faculty members</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Scientific level and knowledge background.</li><li>• Awareness of students' needs.</li><li>• Regularity in the educational process.</li><li>• Commitment to the</li></ul>

	<p>scientific method.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Acceptance of feedback.</li> <li>• Efforts to develop intellectual and competitive skills.</li> <li>• The purpose of the teaching method used.</li> <li>• Development of analytical thinking.</li> <li>• Development of deep insight.</li> <li>• Degree of personal interaction.</li> <li>• Awareness of the role of scientific and moral competence.</li> </ul>
<p><b>4/Evaluation method</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Degree of objectivity and consistency.</li> <li>• Degree of reliability and comprehensiveness.</li> <li>• Avoidance of rote learning.</li> <li>• Emphasis on analytical ability.</li> <li>• Emphasis on critical thinking.</li> </ul>
<p><b>5/Administrative</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Availability of the necessary information for operating and</li> </ul>



<b>system</b>	managing the system. <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Orientation toward the labor market.</li><li>• A favorable environment for practicing sports and artistic activities.</li><li>• Efficiency and effectiveness of the administrative system.</li><li>• Receiving and handling complaints.</li></ul>
<b>6/Material facilities</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Suitability to the nature of the educational process.</li><li>• Development and fulfillment of the aesthetic aspect.</li></ul>

#### **14- Performance of the University Professor:**

In this study, it refers to all the tasks and activities carried out by the university professor, whether inside or outside the university, to achieve the university's quality objectives in line with its vision, mission, and societal expectations. This is referred to as academic performance, where teaching performance is considered one aspect of the professor's overall academic performance.

The performance of the faculty member in this study is evaluated through three domains: teaching performance processes, personal traits, and evaluation processes. These

are inferred from the students' responses (the study sample) to the items of the Faculty Member Performance Evaluation Scale adopted at Salman bin Abdulaziz University, which was employed in this research.

### **Field Study Procedures:**

#### **2- Research Method:**

This study relied on the descriptive method, which describes the phenomenon as it exists in reality. Data were collected from the study sample and then comparisons were made between their responses.

##### **2.1- Study Sample:**

The main study was conducted on a sample of (200) male and female students, selected through a stratified random sampling method from the students of the Faculty of Technology and the Faculty of Social and Human Sciences at the University of El Oued (100 individuals from each faculty). The sample included (91) males and (109) females, of whom (125) were undergraduate students and (75) were master's students.

##### **2.2. Study Instrument:**

To collect data for the present study, the researcher adopted the Faculty Member Performance Evaluation Scale approved at Salman bin Abdulaziz University. The scale consists of (29) items measuring teaching effectiveness across three domains:

Teaching performance processes (10 items), Personal traits (8 items), and Evaluation processes (11 items).

The questionnaire is distributed to students twice during the academic year first in paper form at the beginning of the



**Soumission : 13/04/2025    Acceptation : 09/06/2025    Publication : 25/08/2025**

year, and later electronically at the end. The Quality and Development Agency of the university's colleges, through the quality representative of each department, supervises this process.

Hani Jaradat adapted this instrument by reducing it to (27) items evenly distributed across the three aforementioned domains and verified its validity through expert judgment. The researcher also used Cronbach's alpha coefficient to ensure the reliability of the instrument, with alpha values ranging between (0.71 and 0.90) , indicating a high level of reliability (Jaradat, 2015, p. 98).

### **2.3- Statistical Methods:**

The study employed the t-test to examine differences between means (for both equal and independent samples and unequal independent samples). Statistical data processing was carried out using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS). After statistical analysis, the study reached the following results:

## **3. Presentation of Study Results:**

### **3.1. Presentation and Discussion of the First Hypothesis Results:**

The first hypothesis states that "there are no statistically significant differences between students' evaluations of their professors' performance in light of higher education quality standards attributable to the variable of faculty (Technology / Social and Human Sciences)."

To verify this hypothesis, the t-test was used, and the results are presented in Table (02) below.

Table (02) shows the significance of differences between the mean scores of students' evaluations of their teachers' performance according to higher education quality standards, attributed to the variable of faculty (Technology / Social and Human Sciences).

Students' evaluations of teachers' performance in light of higher education quality standards	Faculty of Technology	Faculty of Social and Human Sciences	N	T Calculated	Significance level at 0.05	Direction of the difference
Number of students	100	100	200	1.018	Not significant	/
Arithmetic mean (M)	92.19	94.45				
Standard deviation (SD)	16.33	15.02				

We read from Table (02) that the calculated t-value equals (1.018), which is not significant at the 0.05 significance level. Therefore, the null hypothesis stating that there are no statistically significant differences between the mean scores of students' evaluations of their teachers' performance according to higher education quality standards attributed to the faculty variable (Technology / Social and Human Sciences) has been accepted.

This result is consistent with the findings of Araf's study (2016) conducted on a sample of students from Mohamed



**Soumission : 13/04/2025    Acceptation : 09/06/2025    Publication : 25/08/2025**

Boudiaf University of M'sila, which consisted of (58) undergraduate students and (16) master's students. The study concluded that there were no statistically significant differences between the mean opinions of the sample students regarding the average efficiency of university professors' performance attributable to the type of academic specialization (Araf, 2016, p. 261).

These results indicate that the student's field of study does not cause a major change in their evaluation of their teachers' performance. The difference between the mean scores of students from the Faculty of Technology (92.19) and those from the Faculty of Social and Human Sciences (94.45) has no statistical significance. According to students' evaluations, the variation in the subject taught by the teacher does not make a difference in their performance.

Considering Abdullah Al-Sahlawi's study (1992), which indicated that "the characteristics and qualities that should be available in a university professor, ranked in descending order of importance, are: interest in preparing lectures, commitment to lecture schedules, enthusiasm for teaching, mastery of the subject matter and keeping up with its updates, fostering students' thinking and creativity, teaching talent and knowledge of teaching methods, objectivity, attention to student guidance, adherence to office hours, verbal ability, interest in research and writing, concern for appearance, friendliness and cheerfulness, participation in public seminars, and participation in university committees" (Ibrahim, 2012, p. 295), it can be said that the extent of the professor's adherence to international standards of higher education quality is not related to specialization or subject matter, but rather to personal traits and the ability to

improve oneself and enhance effectiveness in performing academic duties.

### 3.1. Presentation and Discussion of the Second Hypothesis:

The second hypothesis states that “there are no statistically significant differences between students’ evaluations of their teachers’ performance according to higher education quality standards attributable to the gender variable (female/male).”

To verify this hypothesis, the t-test was used, and Table (03) presents the obtained result:

**Table (03) shows the significance of differences between the mean scores of students’ evaluations of their teachers’ performance according to higher education quality standards, attributed to the gender variable (female/male).**

Students’ evaluations of teachers’ performance in light of higher education quality standards	Females	Males	N	T Calculated	Significance level at 0.05	Direction of the difference
Number of students	109	91	200	0.754	Not significant	/
Arithmetic mean (M)	87.57	89.22				
Standard deviation (SD)	16.44	14.11				



**Soumission : 13/04/2025    Acceptation : 09/06/2025    Publication : 25/08/2025**

Table (04) shows that the calculated t-value is (0.26), which is not significant at the 0.05 significance level. Accordingly, the null hypothesis stating that there are no statistically significant differences between the mean scores of students' evaluations of their teachers' performance according to higher education quality standards attributed to the academic level variable (Master's/Bachelor's) was accepted.

This finding is consistent with the results of the study by Abu Samra and his colleagues (2008), which aimed to identify the indicators of total quality management at Al-Quds University from the students' perspective and to examine the effect of gender, faculty, and academic level on students' responses. The sample consisted of (316) male and female students selected through a stratified random sampling method. The results showed that the indicators of total quality management at Al-Quds University, from the students' perspective, were of a moderate level. The study also indicated that "there were no statistically significant differences at the 0.05 level between the mean responses of the study sample toward the indicators of total quality management at Al-Quds University attributable to the variables of gender, faculty, and academic level" (Abu Samra et al., 2008, p. 12).

This result also agrees with Johari's study (2021) conducted on (317) male and female students from the Department of Social Sciences at Bordj Bou Arréridj University (Algeria), which aimed to evaluate the teaching performance of university professors in light of quality assurance standards in education from the students' perspective. The study found that "the level of university

professors' teaching performance in light of quality assurance standards in education, from the perspective of social sciences students, was moderate. The results also revealed no statistically significant differences between the mean evaluations of students regarding teaching performance attributable to gender, specialization, or academic level" (Johari, 2021, p. 361).

The results of the current study, along with previous studies, can be interpreted in light of the findings of Ahmad Abdullah Ahmad Al-Qahfa (2014), whose study aimed to measure the extent to which teaching performance quality standards were met among faculty members at the College of Education from the students' perspective. The sample included (100) male and female students from the fourth level across all departments of the college. The results showed that the overall level of teaching performance of faculty members was moderate across all dimensions. Only two aspects achieved the acceptable performance level of (66%): the faculty member's performance during the first lecture taught (68%) and his/her performance during interaction and communication with students (66%) (Al-Qahfa, 2014, p. 238).

As shown in Table (04) above, the mean scores of Bachelor's students (89.09) and Master's students (88.53) indicate that the evaluations of both levels regarding their teachers' performance were not high. Hence, students of both levels showed similar evaluation levels, aligning with the findings of Abu Samra et al. (2008) and Al-Qahfa (2014). This may be due to the fact that students' evaluations of faculty performance are influenced by numerous variables other than those directly related to teaching performance itself (Jaradat, 2015, p. 90).



## Conclusion and Study Recommendations

Diagnosing and identifying the criteria for improving the components of the university educational process, on one hand, and organizing and directing the relationship among these components, on the other, ultimately lead to improving the performance of the educational process in terms of its elements and educational outcomes with the faculty being its cornerstone. The professor bears the burden and responsibility for achieving total quality, as he holds the keys to success or failure in realizing quality according to his culture, motivation, readiness, and belief in the mission he fulfills.

“Many studies have emphasized the importance of the role of faculty members as a targeted element in the quality system, as they bear the responsibility for meeting many of the standards related to the quality of education. They represent the most significant inputs by virtue of their roles, and consequently, the quality of outputs depends on the quality of their performance. Achieving qualitative excellence in education thus represents a major challenge for higher education administrators.” (Al-Azzawi & Karim, 2014, p. 3)

The quality of higher education means the ability of the educational output to meet the needs of students, the labor market, society, and all internal and external stakeholders. Achieving educational quality therefore requires mobilizing all human and material resources, policies, systems, curricula, and all directly or indirectly related means and tools to create favorable conditions for innovation and creativity. This ensures that the educational product meets

the requirements that prepare the student to reach the desired level of excellence. The quality of outputs has always been linked to the quality of inputs, processes, methods, and strategies adopted in their production.

In light of the findings of the current and previous studies, several recommendations and suggestions have been proposed, most notably:

- The importance of having clear and publicly available scientific standards through which the performance of university professors can be evaluated.
- The necessity of disseminating the vision, mission, and objectives of universities and scientific institutions in a way that allows interested parties to access them easily, rather than being restricted to specific individuals or administrative bodies.
- Universities should adopt diverse methods and tools of evaluation rather than relying on a single administrative approach to assess faculty performance, as one method alone cannot meet the quality requirements of higher education.
- Establishing new mechanisms for effective evaluation methods, such as self-evaluation, student evaluation, and peer evaluation, given their impact on improving performance levels and enhancing the quality of higher education.
- Adopting teaching performance quality standards as a fundamental criterion for granting academic promotions, rather than relying solely on scientific research for that purpose.
- Training in all forms of teaching performance evaluation and giving it due importance in teaching development programs, as it produces tangible



**Soumission : 13/04/2025    Acceptation : 09/06/2025    Publication : 25/08/2025**

results in improving performance levels and enhancing the quality of education.

- Continuously developing and improving teaching methods and techniques to enhance and refine them, since they represent the main function that defines the scientific and academic reputation of the university. Adopting new, diverse, and effective teaching methods can motivate students and stimulate their thinking abilities which is what many advanced universities around the world aspire to achieve, a concept known as “Teaching for Thinking.”
- Providing material and moral incentives to university faculty members who excel in their teaching performance. A title such as “First Professor in Teaching Performance” could be awarded at the departmental level and subsequently at the faculty level. This would motivate other faculty members to strive for excellence in teaching performance and thereby contribute to achieving higher education quality.

## References:

1. Al-Mawsu’ah Al-‘Arabiyyah Al-‘Alamiyyah (1999). A group of scholars (Eds.). 2nd Edition. Al-Mawsu’ah Foundation for Publishing and Distribution.
2. Ibrahim, M. M. M. (2012). Constructing a system for measuring the academic performance of faculty members in faculties of physical education in light of the standards of the National Authority for Quality

- Assurance and Accreditation. *Assiut Journal for Physical Education Sciences and Arts*, (35)1, 294–321.
3. Abu Samra, M. A., Al-Abbasi, O. M., & Alawneh, M. J. (2008). Indicators of total quality management at Al-Quds University from the perspective of its students. *Al-Quds Open University Journal for Research and Studies*, (12), 11–46.
  4. Ben Oum El-Saâd, N. E. (2020). The role of quality standards in distinguishing the performance of higher education institutions: A comparative study between Kasdi Merbah University Ouargla and the University of Malaya Malaysia. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Kasdi Merbah University, Ouargla, Algeria.
  5. Al-Tamimi, K. B. F. B. A. (2020). Evaluating the quality of teaching performance at Imam Muhammad bin Saud Islamic University in light of the standards of the National Center for Academic Assessment and Accreditation. *Journal of Education, Al-Azhar University - Faculty of Education in Cairo*, 188(1), 1–41.
  6. Jaradat, H. M. (2015). Evaluating faculty members' performance in light of quality and academic accreditation standards from the perspective of mathematics students at Salman bin Abdulaziz University. *AMARABAC: The American Arab Academy for Science and Technology Journal*, 6(18), 87–110.
  7. Johari, S. (2021). Evaluation of university professors' teaching performance in light of quality assurance standards in education from students' perspectives. *Journal of Human and Social Sciences*, 7(2), 361–391.



**Soumission : 13/04/2025    Acceptation : 09/06/2025    Publication : 25/08/2025**

8. Reqad, S. (2015). Assessing the quality of faculty performance in higher education institutions: An exploratory study of faculty members' attitudes at the Faculty of Economic, Commercial, and Management Sciences at Ferhat Abbas University Sétif 1 - toward methods of evaluating teaching performance quality. *Journal of Economic and Management Sciences*, 4(15), 133-170.
9. Saifour, S. (2013). Professional development of university professors in Algeria between the realities and the requirements of job performance: A theoretical study. *Journal of Social Research and Studies, University of El Oued*, (3), 64-79.
10. Ababneh, S. A. A. (2011). Evaluation of university performance quality from the perspective of faculty members at the College of Arts, Misurata University Libya. *Arab Journal for Quality Assurance in Higher Education*, 4(8), 1-24.
11. Ababneh, S. A. (2015). Evaluating the quality performance of the Faculty of Educational Sciences at the University of Jordan in light of the "NCATE" standards for teacher preparation institutions from faculty members' perspectives. *Dirasat: Educational Sciences*, 42(3), 767-785.
12. Al-Abbasi, O. (2004). The reality of the education system at Al-Quds University in light of total quality management standards from the perspectives of faculty members and students. Unpublished master's thesis, Al-Quds University, Palestine.
13. Al-Azzawi, S. M., & Karim, W. Q. (2014). A survey study on the extent to which quality and accreditation

- indicators are available in selecting the teaching staff at the University of Diyala from the perspective of its faculty members. *Diyala Journal for Human Sciences, Iraq*, 21(1), 1-25.
14. Aleimat, S. (2015). Quality and academic accreditation in Jordanian universities. In *Proceedings of the Seventh Annual Conference: "The Impact of Quality and Accreditation on Education"*, Casablanca, Morocco, 127-134.
  15. Aisawi, S. (2024). Standards and methods of achieving quality in higher education institutions. *Al-Bahith Journal for Human and Social Sciences*, 16(2), 125-134.
  16. Al-Qahfa, A. A. A. (2014). The extent to which quality standards are met in teaching performance at the College of Education in Nadera from students' perspectives. *Al-Nasser University Journal*, (4), 238-277.
  17. La'raf, F. (2016). Evaluating the quality and efficiency of university professors' performance from the perspectives of students and faculty members: A field study. *New Economy Journal*, (11), 245-268.
  18. Mohamed, A. W. J., & Adam, M. O. (2021). Evaluation of teaching performance quality of faculty members at the College of Educational Sciences, University of N'Djamena - Chad, from male and female students' perspectives. *Arab Journal for Scientific Publishing (AJSP)*, (27), 308-339.